

112025-0068C1

REMARKS

During the telephone conference on 6/27, the Examiner explained there is no circuitry shown in the drawings and the first 1-8 claims were, in fact, method claims. These 1-8 claims were found to be allowable in an Office Action dated 1/12/2006, but on further review the Examiner changed his position, as explained during the telephone conference. It was decided that this supplemental amended was in order.

As amended herein, claims 1-8 are method claims using essentially the same words as found in the original claims 1-8; no new matter is added. The term "router method" is used and is, respectfully, proper.


Claim 17 - 25 have a preamble that reads, "A (The) router..." Since FIG.s 1, 7, and 9 show routers in block form with no particular circuitry. These claims are, respectfully, in a proper form. The functions described in these claims 17 - 25 are consistent with computing and processing capabilities found in prior art routers, although these functions as are not found in known prior art routers.

There was a response, dated 4/12/2006 to the office Action of 1/12/2006, which amended and presented arguments making all the claims 1-27 allowable. This amendment of 4/12/2006 and its arguments remain, respectfully, relevant and convincing.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested for all claims 1-27 in this case.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Edwin H. Paul  
Reg. No. 31,405  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-3040 (direct to the above)